

Thomas M. Zuckerman

December 10, 1998

Steve Ritchey
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: CALFED Revised Phase II Report

Dear Steve:

As I mentioned to you yesterday, my cursory review of the "hot off the press" Revised Phase II Report dated December 9, 1998, indicates that there are some changes that need to be made to make the document consistent with the revisions that I participated in making to the conveyance and water quality sections. In the interim, I tried to go through the document to identify where I think these additional changes would be appropriate. Before I get started, however, let me express my appreciation to you and the process in general for the willingness to consider revisions which, hopefully, will eventually enable the Delta interests to support the CALFED program. As you know, this is a tricky subject for us, but I think the recent significant changes made are a big step in that direction. It will take some time to coordinate with the various interests in this community, including our legislative representatives, to be able to confirm that this is possible.

The basic Phase II strategy with regard to Delta conveyance is set forth in the last three paragraphs on page 86, continuing on to page 87. It occurs to me that some changes should be made in the second sentence in the third paragraph so that the third paragraph would be consistent with the first two. I would suggest the following changes to that sentence:

"A combination of these two factors also could result in a decision to proceed with implementation ~~construction~~ of an isolated facility and/or any other water management actions to meet CALFED goals and objectives after assessment of the effectiveness of the

146 West Weber Avenue/Stockton, CA 95202/Telephone (209) 943-5431

G - 0 0 7 4 0 8

G-007408

Steve Ritchey
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
December 10, 1998
Page 2

initial through-Delta conveyance actions,
and after a determination that such facility
and/or actions would be effective in
resolving these problems."

Other changes that appear to be appropriate to achieve consistency with this strategy occur in other parts of the document as follows:

1. Page 35, 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence: This sentence implies that the isolated facility is in a "default decision" posture whereas the substance of the revised strategy is that a determination needs to be made at that time that the isolated facility is the best solution. Consequently, the language that starts "move forward with the modifications" should be broadened to include other water management actions.

2. Page 38, last bullet point: The list of possibilities which now contains source control of bromide, organic carbon and pathogens should be expanded to include blending with other high quality source waters.

3. Page 43, 1st full paragraph, 3rd line: The language "result in construction" should be modified to be consistent with the language in the conveyance strategy section ("decision to proceed with implementation").

4. Page 46, 1st bullet point: The words "would warrant" in the 5th line should be changed to "could lead to."

5. Page 59, the first paragraph under the heading Bromide and Organic Carbon Management concludes with a statement that ignores salinity intrusion control as an opportunity to reduce bromide concentrations. This concept should be worked in.

6. Page 117, paragraph entitled Isolated Facility: I think the paragraph numbered 1 is okay. The paragraph numbered 2, however, is inappropriate given the decision to defer a decision to implement an isolated facility until a full effort is made to optimizing a through-Delta conveyance with

Steve Ritchey
CALFED Bay-Delta Program
December 10, 1998
Page 3

other associated water management actions. I would strongly recommend that paragraph 2 be deleted.

7. Page 140, in the chart entitled Estimated CALFED Stage 1 Program and Capital Costs in Millions, there is a conveyance item totalling \$675 million. Footnote 7 indicates that this includes South Delta Improvements (408), North Delta Improvements (195), and Isolated Facilities studies (72). Due to the terseness of the explanation, it is difficult to know how it is proposed to spend \$72M on isolated facilities studies, unless this is a holdover from the language just discussed above related to project environmental documentation and feasibility studies which, as stated above, are inappropriate. On the other hand, if the intent is to spend some money in furtherance of paragraph 1 on page 117, that would be understandable, but the sum of \$72M appears grossly excessive. My suggestion is to reduce this expenditure by \$72M or expand the explanation and decrease the proposed expenditure consistent with the level of activities that might be appropriate under this revised strategy.

I am taking the liberty of distributing copies of this letter to Assemblyman Machado and some of our other local people in the spirit of beginning the process referred to at the beginning of this letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,


THOMAS M. ZUCKERMAN

TMZ:csf

cc: Senator Patrick Johnston
Assemblyman Mike Machado
Dante John Nomellini, CDWA
Alex Hildebrand, SDWA
John Herrick, SDWA
George Basye, NDWA
Bob Clark, CCVNDWA
Margit Aramburu, Delta Protection Commission